REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant thanks Examiner for the detailed Office Action dated April 4, 2006. In response to the issues raised, the Applicant offers the following submissions.

Claims – 35USC§103

Claims 1 to 5 stand rejected as obvious in light of US 6,120,138 to Xiao et al in light of US 2004/0055661 to Yuen.

We submit that the last report has been made final in error. The cited references fail to teach all the elements of the invention defined by claims 1 or 5 and therefore do not support a §103 rejection. It is well established that the combination of the cited disclosures must teach every element of the claim before the question of motivation to combine can be considered.

Claims 1 and 5 define the printing fluid dispenser to have mating features on the two relatively moveable portions of the housing. These features mate together to prevent relative movement until the predetermined level of operative force is applied after which relative movement requires much less force.

The Examiner has equated the threaded shank 332 and the central hole 338 of Xiao with the mated features of claims 1 and 5. The shank of the plunger and the threaded hole facilitate relative movement of the two portions rather than preventing it. There is no requirement for the application of a threshold force, after which rotation of the shank becomes much easier.

The Examiner contends that Yuen teaches the application of a threshold force followed by relative movement with the application of significantly less force. The Examiner acknowledges that this is not explicit in the disclosure, but rather implied. We disagree that piercing the gasket 19 with the needle 26 will require the application of much more torque to the actuation cup 12 relative to any subsequent rotation. This is not inherently the case as any rotation of the cup 12 must overcome the increasing bias of the spring 24 and the friction of the needle in the gasket 19. In fact Yuen states at paragraph 63 that resistance to rotation begins when the ink pouch 16 is compressed, not when the gasket is pierced.

In light of the above, the cited references fail to teach all the elements of independent claims 1 or 5. Accordingly, Xiao and Yuen fail to render the invention obvious under the provisions of §103 and we submit that the previous report was made final in error.

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejection has been successfully traversed. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,
Applicant:

KIA SILVERBROOK

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia
Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com
Telephone: +612 9818 6633
Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762